

In the four actions, the damage claims alleging violations of federal and state drinking water standards against the regulated utilities are not preempted. Thus, we reverse the judgment of the Court of Appeal insofar as it found preemption as to those claims. Regarding the remaining claims against the regulated water utilities, we affirm the judgment of the Court of Appeal. We further affirm the judgment of the Court of Appeal insofar as it held that the causes of action against the nonregulated water providers and industrial defendants are not preempted. We remand the case to that court for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

We Concur:  
George, C.J.  
Kennard, J.  
Baxter, J.  
Brown, J.  
Moreno, J.

\*Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division 2, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6, of the California Constitution.

S091069      Amelco Electric, Plaintiff and Respondent

v.

City of Thousand Oaks, Defendant and Appellant.

The judgment of the Court of Appeal is reversed, and the part regarding breach of contract is remanded to the Court of Appeal with instructions to remand to the trial court for a retrial on the issue of damages.

Brown, J.

We Concur:

George, C.J.

Baxter, J.

Chin, J.

Moreno, J.

Dissenting Opinion by Werdegarr, J.

I Concur:

Kennard, J.

2nd Dist.      Old Line Life Insurance Company of America, Petitioner

B155877      v.

Div. 6      Ventura County Superior Court, Respondent

S104078      Majorie Hogg, Real Party in Interest

Application for stay and petition for review DENIED.

4th Dist.      Custodian of Records of Costa Mesa Police Department, Petitioner

G030179      v.

Div. 3      Orange County Superior Court, Respondent

S103956      Zedekiah Zedekiah, Real Party in Interest

Application for stay and petition for review DENIED.

Orders were filed in the following matters extending the time within which to grant or deny a petition for review to and including the date indicated, or until review is either granted or denied:

B154318/S102743    Beverly Health and Rehabilitation Service, Inc. v. Santa Barbara County Superior Court; People, RPI – March 7, 2002.

B154586/S102740    Rajan Rama Ayyar v. Santa Barbara County Superior Court; People, RPI – March 7, 2002.

E030715/S103003    In re Jose Manuel Vargas on Habeas Corpus – March 18, 2002.

S024416    People, Respondent

v.

Dellano Leroy Cleveland and Chauncey Jamal Veasley, Appellants

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel David Macher's representation that he anticipates filing appellant Chauncey Jamal Veasley's opening brief by February 28, 2002, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to February 28, 2002. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

S041008    People, Respondent

v.

Jaime Armando Hoyos, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including February 8, 2002.

S046176    People, Respondent

v.

Glen Cornwell, Appellant

Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy Attorney General Jean Marinovich's representation that she anticipates filing the respondent's brief by March 1, 2002, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to that date. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

